



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## THE DISTRIBUTION OF IMMIGRANTS IN THE UNITED STATES.

WITHIN the last fifteen years the statement that recent immigrants, and above all illiterate immigrants, cling to the great cities, especially those of the Atlantic seaboard, and swarm in the slum districts of those cities, has been made and repeated until it has become accepted. The emphasis laid upon this aspect of the immigration question has increased rapidly, and is still increasing. Some writers believe it is the most serious phase of our immigration problem, many that it is so serious as to demand the attention and even the intervention of the Federal government or of the State governments.

The object of this paper is to examine the evidence on which this opinion has been based. I begin with a summary of important statements of it which have fallen under my eye. The quotations have been arranged in chronological order.

The persons of foreign birth in the United States seem to seek the large cities.<sup>1</sup>

The proportion of foreign born in the principal cities is very nearly twice as great as the proportion of foreign born in the country at large. If we go a step further, and contrast the proportions of foreign born in the principal cities and in the remainder of the country outside of these 124 cities, it is seen that the proportions are very nearly as 3 to 1. . . . It appears then from these figures that, taken as a whole, the element of foreign birth seeks the cities with far greater avidity than does the element of native birth.<sup>2</sup>

Illiterates largely stagnate near the Atlantic seacoast, while the more educated nations move on to build up the new States. . . .

<sup>1</sup> Mayo-Smith, *Immigration and Emigration*, p. 71 (1890).

<sup>2</sup> Eleventh Census, *Population*, Part I., p. lxxxix (1895).

The illiterate races, such as the Hungarians, Galicians, and Italians, remain to lower the standard of the already crowded Atlantic territory.<sup>1</sup>

The need is to devise some system by which undesirable immigrants shall be kept out entirely, while desirable immigrants are properly distributed throughout the country.<sup>2</sup>

The illiterate immigrants congregated chiefly in the slums of our great cities.<sup>3</sup>

Under present conditions, immigrants are becoming concentrated in the East, for the most part in the large cities, and especially in and about the city of New York. This congestion of aliens is very nearly, if not altogether, the most menacing feature of the present immigration.<sup>4</sup>

The problem of immigration with us is essentially one of distribution. The demand for laborers is great outside of the cities, but the gregarious Italian prefers to increase our menacing urban congestion instead of going to the country.<sup>5</sup>

Since we cannot depend on the immigrants to scatter, means must be taken to diffuse them throughout the country and to localize them away from the great cities.<sup>6</sup>

Instead of going to those sections where there is a sore need for farm labor, they [sc., the immigrants] congregate in the larger cities, mostly along the Atlantic seaboard, where they constitute a dangerous and unwholesome element of our population.<sup>7</sup>

Landing in the large cities, they [sc., the average emigrants of to-day] seldom move on to the greater air spaces of the country.<sup>8</sup>

As much as possible should be done to distribute the immigrants upon the land, and keep them away from the congested tenement-house districts of the great cities.<sup>9</sup>

Some pressure must be brought to bear upon the immigrants to secure distribution, because under the present system they do not voluntarily distribute themselves.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Fifty-fourth Congress, First Session, Senate Report No. 290, pp. 8, 9 (1896).

<sup>2</sup> President's Message (1903).

<sup>3</sup> Senator Lodge in *Century Magazine*, vol. lxxvii. p. 468 (1904).

<sup>4</sup> *The Outlook*, vol. lxxvi. p. 489 (1904).

<sup>5</sup> G. C. Speranza in *The Outlook*, vol. lxxvi. p. 938 (1904).

<sup>6</sup> E. Norton in *Annals of American Academy*, vol. xxiv. p. 161 (1904).

<sup>7</sup> F. P. Sargent in *Annals of American Academy*, vol. xxiv. p. 153 (1904).

<sup>8</sup> J. D. Whelpley in *Fortnightly*, vol. lxxxiii. p. 317 (1905).

<sup>9</sup> President's Message (1905).

<sup>10</sup> Prescott F. Hall, *Immigration*, p. 300 (1905).

This opinion bids fair before the present article is printed to give rise to legislation. The bill to regulate immigration, which passed the Senate May 24, 1906, contained a new section, of which the following is the material part:—

SECT. 39. That the Commissioner-General of Immigration, under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to establish and maintain at each of the immigrant stations within the United States a bureau of information. Such bureau shall be properly officered, and shall, under such rules and regulations as the Commissioner-General of Immigration may from time to time establish, collect and furnish to all incoming aliens, who may ask for the same, data as to the resources, products, and manufactures of each State, Territory, and District of the United States; the prices of land and the character of the soils therein; the routes of travel thereto; the cost of transportation thereto; the opportunities for employment in the various skilled and unskilled occupations in each of said States, Territories, and Districts; the rates of wages paid for such labor, respectively, in each of said States, Territories, and Districts; the cost of living therein, and all other information that in the judgment of said Commissioner-General of Immigration might tend to enlighten the alien immigrants coming to such immigrant stations as to the inducements to settlement in each of the various States, Territories, and Districts of the United States: Provided, That the Bureau provided for in this section may, at the discretion of the Commissioner-General of Immigration, furnish such other information to alien immigrants as may be useful and proper.

From the foregoing quotations the following statements of the prevalent opinion, and, so far as I have noticed, the only opinion to find frequent expression in the public prints, may be framed.

I. The foreign-born population of the United States has a stronger tendency towards cities than the native population.

II. This tendency is much stronger among recent immigrants than among those who entered the country a generation ago.

III. It is much stronger among illiterate immigrants than it is among those who are able to write some language.

IV. This tendency is disadvantageous to the immigrants and an economic and social danger to the United States.

V. The evil results of this tendency are so great as to necessitate the creation of agencies, Federal, State, or private, to counteract or correct it.

I. The evidence in support of the first proposition is stated clearly and effectively in the Report of the Industrial Commission, under the heading "Tendency of Foreign Born towards Cities."<sup>1</sup> The figures for 1890 there presented show that in the 124 cities of the United States, each of which had at least 25,000 inhabitants, the foreign born were 29.2 per cent., and in the rest of the country only 10.6 per cent. of the population. The figures for 1900, since published, show that in the 160 cities of like size the foreign born were 26.0 per cent., and in the rest of the country only 9.4 per cent. of the population. These figures seem to show beyond question that in cities the proportion of foreign born is almost thrice that in the rest of the country, and consequently to demonstrate that the immigrant has a tendency towards cities stronger than that of the native.

To the figures in this form, however, it may be objected that they include the South as well as the North, and the South is mainly rural and also comparatively unattractive to the immigrant. A fairer measure of the difference between the tendencies towards cities on the part of the immigrant and the native may be had by excluding from the figures those for the Southern States and confining the comparison to the North and West.

<sup>1</sup> Vol. xv. p. 78 (1901).

The following table shows the results of a comparison in this form <sup>1</sup>—

SIZE OF PLACE OF RESIDENCE.	PER CENT. OF POPULATION FOREIGN BORN.			
	North Atlantic Division.	North Central Division.	Western Division.	North and West.
Total . . . . .	22.6	15.8	20.7	19.0
All cities . . . . .	27.8	21.2	24.6	25.1
Cities of 100,000+ . . . . .	32.1	27.2	28.0	30.1
Cities of 25,000-100,000 . . . . .	25.8	19.1	26.1	23.7
Cities of 8,000-25,000 . . . . .	23.6	16.5	22.3	20.4
Cities of 4,000-8,000 . . . . .	19.6	13.2	19.8	16.6
Cities of 2,500-4,000 . . . . .	18.3	14.0	18.8	16.4
Country districts . . . . .	11.5	12.4	18.0	12.7

These figures show that the smallest proportion of foreign born is found in the country districts and the largest proportion in the largest cities, and that, as a rule, with only one exception out of fifteen cases, the smaller the population of a place, the smaller the proportion of foreign born in its population. They show, also, that the proportion of foreign born in the population of the large cities of the United States is about two and one-half times as great as that in the country districts. These figures seem to confirm and establish the conclusion that the foreign born have a stronger tendency towards cities than the native population.

But to draw such a conclusion at once, as has usually been done, is to overlook an important difference between the points of arrival of our native and our foreign-born population. The native arriving by birth usually begins his life in the country, the foreign born arriving by immigration usually begins his American life in a city, and much or all of the difference between the distribution of native and foreign born might be due to this fact, and not

<sup>1</sup> For the figures from which these per cents. are derived and for much fuller details see Supplementary Analysis and Derivative Tables, Twelfth Census (1906), Tables X. and XII.

to any difference in the tendencies of the two classes. The best clew to the distribution of the native population at the beginning of life between city and country is found in the distribution of the children under one year of age, only one in five hundred of whom was born abroad. In 1900 there were 433,580 such children enumerated in the 160 cities of continental United States, each having at least 25,000 inhabitants, and 1,483,312 enumerated in the rest of the country.<sup>1</sup> But in this case also it may be fairer to exclude the figures for the Southern States. In the large cities of the North Atlantic, North Central, and Western divisions 384,473 children under one year of age were enumerated in 1900, in the country districts 811,451, so that more than two-thirds of the children born in the North and West and more than three-fourths of the children born in any part of the United States start in life outside of a city.

With immigrant arrivals the facts are very different. In the ten years ending June 30, 1900, there were 3,562,382 immigrants who entered the United States at some known port. This leaves out of consideration the immigrants who came in from Europe through Canada between 1893 and 1900, and whose point of arrival in the United States is unknown. Of these 3,562,382 immigrants, 3,497,009, or 98.2 per cent., came in at some port having at least 100,000 inhabitants, and 65,373, or 1.8 per cent., came in at some port of less population.

But it is needful, also, to take into account both the immigrants who came in through Canada and the unknown number of natives of Canada and Mexico who entered the United States. The number of immigrants from Europe landing in Canada and bound for the United States has been reported only since 1893-94. During the seven years 1893-1900 they numbered 81,116, and the per cent.

<sup>1</sup>Twelfth Census, vol. ii., Tables II. and IX.

they formed of the number landing at known points in the United States in the same year rose steadily from 2.4 in 1894-95 to 5.5 in 1899-1900. It is reasonable to assume from the series of per cents that during the three years 1890-93 the immigrants landing in Canada for the United States were about 2.5 per cent. of those landing at known American ports during the same period. On this assumption they were about 38,390,—a number which, added to the 81,116, gives 119,506 immigrants through Canada to the United States for the decade 1890-1900, and 3,681,888 as the total immigration from all countries except Canada and Mexico during the ten years 1890-1900.

A rough estimate of the number of immigrants from Canada and Mexico to the United States during the same decade may be reached by a resort to the census figures of the foreign born. These show what ratio the natives of Canada and Mexico in the United States bear to the natives of all other foreign countries. The figures are as follows:—

DATE.	FOREIGN BORN.			Per cent. that Canadians and Mexicans make of all others.
	Total.	Canadians and Mexicans.	All other foreign born.	
1900 . . . .	10,341,276	1,283,200	9,058,076	14.17
1890 . . . .	9,249,547	1,058,791	8,190,756	12.93
1880 . . . .	6,679,943	785,556	5,894,387	13.33
1870 . . . .	5,567,229	535,899	5,031,330	15.61
1860 . . . .	4,138,697	277,436	3,866,261	7.18
1850 . . . .	2,244,602	161,028	2,083,574	7.73

From the foregoing figures it seems reasonable to assume that the immigration from Canada and Mexico, 1890-1900, amounted to about 14.17 per cent. of the immigration from all other countries. With the aid of this assumption the total immigration to the United States, classified with reference to point of arrival, may be given as follows:—



<i>Point of arrival.</i>	<i>Immigration 1890-1900.</i>
New York City . . . . .	2,812,345
Some other port of 100,000+ inhabitants:—	
Baltimore	
Boston	
New Orleans	
Philadelphia	
San Francisco	684,664
Some known port having less than 100,000 inhabitants . .	65,373
Canada . . . . .	119,506
1893-1900 . . . . .	81,116
1890-93 (estimated) . . . . .	38,390
Unknown:—	
From Canada and Mexico (estimated) . . . . .	521,300
Total . . . . .	4,203,188

If we assume that all these 521,300 immigrants from Canada and Mexico and also all the 119,506 immigrants through Canada entered the United States at some place having less than 100,000 inhabitants (a most improbable hypothesis), then 706,179 of the 4,203,188 immigrants who arrived during the decade 1890-1900, or 16.8 per cent., entered outside a large city, and 83.2 per cent. entered at an urban gateway. We have thus fixed a maximum limit of 98.2 per cent. and a minimum limit of 83.2 per cent. for the proportion of our immigrants entering at a large city, and the evidence also warrants the belief that the true proportion is much nearer the upper than the lower limit. There seems little doubt that more than nine-tenths of the immigrants enter the United States at a city of at least 100,000 inhabitants.

If we grant this, we are in a better position for judging the present distribution of the foreign born between city and country, as reported by the census.<sup>1</sup> That distribution in 1900 is given below:—

	<i>Number.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>
Total foreign born . . . . .	10,341,276	100.0
Residing in all cities . . . . .	6,859,078	66.3
Residing in cities of 100,000+ . . . . .	4,008,085	38.8
Residing in cities of 25,000-100,000 . . . . .	1,122,196	10.8
Residing in cities of 8,000-25,000 . . . . .	953,827	9.2
Residing in cities of 4,000-8,000 . . . . .	479,866	4.6
Residing in cities of 2,500-4,000 . . . . .	295,104	2.9
Residing in country districts . . . . .	3,482,198	33.7

<sup>1</sup> Twelfth Census, Supplementary Analysis (1906), Tables X. and XIV.

If nine-tenths of these ten million immigrants reached the United States at some city having at least 100,000 inhabitants and less than four-tenths were residing in such cities in 1900, then more than half of our immigrants must have dispersed from the cities where they landed. But this is not all. Of the 4,008,085 foreign born enumerated in the cities of 100,000+ in 1900, only 1,978,350, or less than half, were in a seaport of that size. There must have been much migration of the foreign born from the seaport of arrival to another seaport of 100,000+; but, disregarding all such currents, it seems clear that at least 8,362,926 foreign born, or 80.9 per cent. of all those in the country, had left the port of arrival before the date of the census. The number of 1,978,350 foreign born, which is the maximum limit of the number who had not left the port of arrival, is about equal to the number of foreign born who had been in the United States less than 8.4 years. It seems, therefore, that the number of immigrants who remain in the port of arrival more than 8.4 years is not greater than the number who leave the port of arrival for some other part of the country in a shorter time than that.

The total reported immigration arriving at any known port in the United States between July 1, 1890, and June 30, 1900, was 3,562,382. Of this 2,812,345, or 78.9 per cent., entered at the port of New York. Of the total immigration reported and unreported (4,203,188), 66.8 per cent. landed at New York. Doubtless at least seven in ten of our immigrants arrive there, but only about one in fourteen of the children born in the North and West and one in twenty-two of the children born in the country are born in that city. Under such conditions the swarms of immigrants found at any time in New York are no more conclusive evidence of a tendency to remain there than

the clouds hanging around a mountain are proof that there is no wind at the summit to blow it away.

With regard to the first point the conclusion is that the foreign born constitute about two and one-half times as great a proportion of the population in the largest cities as they do in the rural districts, and that, the smaller the size of a city, the smaller, as a rule, is the proportion of foreign born in its population. But, when this fact is considered in relation to the places of arrival of these immigrants, it affords no evidence of a tendency on their part to cling to or stagnate in the cities of the country.

II. The evidence submitted thus far may be deemed inconclusive because the figures for all the foreign born living in continental United States in 1900 are combined. The foreign born of a generation ago, it may be urged, had a tendency towards the country districts quite as marked as the tendency of their successors towards the cities. Millions of survivors of the earlier currents of migration from foreign countries to the farming districts are still living in the North, and especially in the great agricultural States of the West. Figures for the total foreign-born population, therefore, if not irrelevant, are at least inconclusive. The objection has weight, and is entitled to a patient examination.

If it be true that recent immigrants have a stronger tendency towards cities than those who entered the country a generation ago, we should expect that the change in the decade 1890-1900 would be in the direction of an increased massing of the foreign born in the cities. The following table shows the per cent. of foreign born in each group of cities and in the country districts in 1890 and 1900:<sup>1</sup>—

<sup>1</sup> For figures from which these per cents. are obtained and for per cents. in greater detail see Twelfth Census, Supplementary Analysis and Derivative Tables, Tables X., XI., XIV., and XV.

	<i>Foreign-born Population in</i>	
	1900.	1890.
Total . . . . .	100.0	100.0
All cities . . . . .	66.3	61.4
Cities having 100,000+ . . . . .	38.8	33.4
Cities having 25,000-100,000 . . . . .	10.8	10.8
Cities having 8,000-25,000 . . . . .	9.2	9.7
Cities having 4,000-8,000 . . . . .	4.6	4.6
Cities having 2,500-4,000 . . . . .	2.9	2.9
Country districts . . . . .	33.7	38.6

Before considering the meaning of these figures, it may be well to add those for the Northern and Western States, in which about seventeen out of eighteen (94.4 per cent.) of the foreign born live.

	FOREIGN-BORN POPULATION IN					
	North Atlantic.		North Central.		Western.	
	1900.	1890.	1900.	1890.	1900.	1890.
Total . . . . .	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
All cities . . . . .	83.8	79.9	57.8	47.1	48.3	46.8
Cities having 100,000+ . . . . .	50.8	43.9	30.8	26.6	19.1	19.7
Cities having 25,000-100,000 . . . . .	13.9	15.5	6.4	5.6	14.0	11.9
Cities having 8,000-25,000 . . . . .	11.0	11.8	7.8	8.3	6.4	6.9
Cities having 4,000-8,000 . . . . .	5.3	5.5	4.1	4.0	4.5	4.4
Cities having 2,500-4,000 . . . . .	2.8	3.2	2.7	2.6	4.3	3.9
Country districts . . . . .	16.2	20.1	48.2	52.9	51.7	53.2

These figures show both for the country as a whole and for the North and West that the proportion of the foreign born living in the country has materially decreased, and the proportion living in cities, especially the large cities, has much increased, and seem at first a clear confirmation of the increased tendency of our recent immigrants towards city life.

But the rapid growth of urban population and the slow growth of rural population are familiar facts. The increased proportion of the foreign born in large cities may be due partly or entirely to the increased proportion of the total population in those cities. A more significant comparison, therefore, is one showing the proportion of

foreign born to the population in 1890 and 1900. Such a comparison is made in the following table:—

	PER CENT. FOREIGN BORN IN TOTAL POPULATION.					
	North Atlantic.		North Central.		Western.	
	1900.	1890.	1900.	1890.	1900.	1890.
Total . . . . .	22.6	22.3	15.8	18.1	20.7	24.8
All cities . . . . .	27.8	29.0	21.2	25.8	24.6	31.2
Cities having 100,000+ . . . . .	32.1	34.0	27.2	33.8	28.0	37.5
Cities having 25,000-100,000 . . . . .	25.8	28.6	19.1	21.6	26.1	31.0
Cities having 8,000-25,000 . . . . .	23.6	24.8	16.5	21.8	22.3	25.7
Cities having 4,000-8,000 . . . . .	19.6	20.5	13.2	17.3	19.8	26.6
Cities having 2,500-4,000 . . . . .	18.3	17.6	14.0	15.5	18.8	24.8
Country districts . . . . .	11.5	11.7	12.4	14.3	18.0	21.1

As the proportion of foreign born to the total population in the country at large decreased from 14.8 per cent. in 1890 to 13.6 per cent. in 1900, it would be expected that the proportion in the several classes of cities and in the several divisions would also be smaller. This expectation is confirmed by the above figures. But, if the foreign-born population has been massing disproportionately in the cities, as is generally believed, this tendency would manifest itself in a smaller decline in the proportion of foreign born in the great cities. Just the opposite is the fact. The decline in the proportion of foreign born to total population is greatest, as a rule, in the large cities and least, as a rule, in the country districts. Perhaps this difference may be stated most clearly as follows: in the North Atlantic division the proportion of foreign born in the population of cities of 100,000+ was 2.9 times as great in 1890 and 2.8 times as great in 1900 as the proportion in the country districts of the same division at the same date; in the North Central division the proportion in large cities in 1890 was 2.4 and in 1900 2.2 times that in the country districts; in the Western division the

proportion in large cities in 1890 was 1.8 times and in 1900 was 1.6 times that in the country districts. In other words, the differences between the large cities and the country districts in the proportion of foreign born to total population tended to decrease in the decade 1890 to 1900.

These figures seem to warrant, if not to compel, the belief, contrary to the prevailing conviction, that the foreign born are showing an increased tendency towards the country districts, yet I do not so interpret them. They should be judged with reference to two probabilities: first, that for many foreign born the large city is a way station on the journey to a smaller city or a rural district; and, secondly, that the average length of residence on the part of our foreign-born population was probably greater in 1900 than in 1890.

The preceding argument may be thought to have demonstrated the first point. Confirmatory evidence may be found, however, in the figures of the Twelfth Census, showing the number of years spent in the United States by the foreign born.<sup>1</sup>

Distribution of the foreign-born population of city and country according to the duration of residence in the United States, 1900:—

DURATION OF RESIDENCE.	NUMBER RESIDING IN		PER CENT. OF TOTAL	
	Cities having at least 25,000 inhabitants.	Smaller cities and country districts.	For cities having at least 25,000 inhabitants.	For smaller cities and country districts.
Total foreign born . . . .	5,130,281	5,210,995		
Duration unknown . . . .	379,980	632,673		
Duration known . . . .	4,750,301	4,578,322	100.0	100.0
Less than 5 years . . . .	538,459	465,410	11.4	10.2
5 to 9 years . . . .	774,716	584,515	16.3	12.8
10 to 14 years . . . .	914,146	682,784	19.2	14.9
15 to 19 years . . . .	794,867	771,581	16.7	16.8
20 years and over . . . .	1,728,113	2,074,035	36.4	45.3
Median duration in years			15.9	18.6

<sup>1</sup> The figures from which the numbers and per cents. have been derived may be found in Twelfth Census, Supplementary Analysis (1906), Table XXIX.

The preceding figures show that the foreign-born population living outside of the 160 cities of continental United States had resided in this country in 1900 on the average about 2.7 years longer than the foreign-born population in those cities, an excess equal to about one-sixth of the time the city foreign born have been in the country. The argument that the currents have flowed and are flowing from city to country, although strengthened by these figures, is still incomplete, because they are consistent with the hypothesis that we have to do with the results of two currents of migration,—an earlier current to the country districts and a later one to the cities.

That our foreign-born population had been in the United States, on the average, a longer time in 1900 than in 1890 is an inference, almost a necessary inference, from the immigration figures of 1880 to 1900. The reported immigrants 1880 to 1890 numbered 5,246,613; those 1890 to 1900 numbered 3,687,564, the number in the earlier decade exceeding that in the later by more than one and one-half million. This fact would be almost certain to result in a longer average duration of residence in the United States in 1900 than in 1890. Unfortunately, the answers to the question, "Number of years in the United States?" introduced into the Federal census for the first time in 1890, were tabulated at that census only for the aliens, and consequently no comparison of results for 1890 and 1900 can be drawn.

In default of anything better the following computation may throw some light on the question whether the foreign-born population had been longer in the United States in 1900 than in 1890. Of the foreign born enumerated in the United States in 1900 the duration of residence of 90.21 per cent. was reported.<sup>1</sup> If the information had been asked and obtained with the same degree of

<sup>1</sup> Twelfth Census, Abstract, Table X.

completeness for the 9,249,547 foreign born enumerated in 1890, then the duration of residence of about 8,344,000 would have been ascertained. In 1900 there were 2,363,097 foreign born enumerated as having been in the United States less than ten years.<sup>1</sup> This is 64.1 per cent. of the immigrants reported as having come in during the preceding ten years. If we assume that 64.1 per cent. of the 5,246,613 immigrants who came in between 1880 and 1890 would have been found in the United States in 1890, and have reported their length of residence as less than ten years, there would have been about 3,363,200. On these assumptions the per cent. of the foreign born of known length of residence who had been in the country less than ten years would have been 40.3 in 1890: it was 25.4 in 1900. This computation goes far to confirm the theory that the average duration of residence of the foreign born was decidedly greater in 1900 than in 1890.

If the large city is for many immigrants a way station on the journey to the smaller cities and rural districts, and if the average duration of residence of immigrants in 1900 was materially greater than in 1890, this would have afforded time for a larger proportion of the immigrants to have reached their destination by the later date.

Thus far we have failed to find any evidence that the tendency of the foreign born towards urban life is any stronger or any weaker than the tendency of the natives of this country towards urban life. All the facts examined have been found consistent with the theory that the larger proportion of foreign born in our cities is due to the fact that nine-tenths of them arrive in cities, and that it takes them a long time to disperse from these centres.

The Twelfth Census, however, offers further interesting evidence on this point. The number of years in the

<sup>1</sup> Twelfth Census, Abstract, Table XLVIII.



United States is reported for the foreign-born population not only of continental United States and of the several States and Territories, but also of the 160 cities each having at least 25,000 inhabitants, and for years under six by each year of residence. These figures make it possible to study the distribution over the United States and between city and country of the immigrants who have been in the United States a short period of time. The last census reported 201,128 foreign born on the first day of June, 1900, who had been in the country less than one year. The Bureau of Immigration reported 431,501 immigrants, other than immigrants from Canada and Mexico, to have arrived between June 1, 1899, and June 1, 1900. If we add 14.2 per cent. to this number for an estimate of the immigrants from Canada and Mexico in that year, we have an estimated number of 492,600 immigrants during the census year 1899-1900, of whom only 40.8 per cent. were found by the census at the end of that time. To attempt a reconciliation of these figures would involve too long a digression, but it may be well to mention that the census found 1,012,653 foreign born whose length of residence was unreported, and that probably very many of these were recent arrivals with whom the enumerators may have found it difficult to communicate.

The places of arrival of the 448,572 immigrants who reached the United States during the year ending June 30, 1900, may fairly be taken as indicative of the places of arrival of the 201,128 foreign born reported by the census as having been in the country less than one year on the first day of June, 1900. These immigrants reported by the Bureau of Immigration increased by 14.2 per cent. for the Canadian and Mexican immigrants, give a total of 512,092 for that fiscal year. Assuming that all those from Canada and Mexico arrived in the United States outside of a city of 25,000 inhabitants,—a most improbable hy-

pothesis, the main reason for which is that it is more unfavorable to my argument than any other which can be suggested,—we have the following figures:—

<i>Place of arrival.</i>	<i>Total immigrants 1899-1900.</i>	<i>Per cent. distribution.</i>
Total . . . . .	512,092	100.0
New York City . . . . .	341,712	66.8
Some other city of 25,000+ . . . . .	71,842	14.0
Total arriving outside a large city . . . . .	98,548	19.2
Some place of 0-25,000 . . . . .	11,828	2.3
Through Canada . . . . .	23,200	4.5
From Canada and Mexico . . . . .	63,520	12.4

If the 201,128 foreign born of less than one year's residence reported by the census be assumed to have arrived at city and country ports in the same proportions as the immigrants of 1899-1900, they would have been distributed on arrival as appears below. Over against the number among these 201,128 estimated to have arrived at each class of place during the year is set the number found there by the census at the end of the year:—

<i>Place of arrival.</i>	<i>Estimated number arriving.</i>	<i>Number enumerated.</i>
Total . . . . .	201,128	201,128
New York City . . . . .	134,350	23,843
Some other seaport of 25,000+ . . . . .	28,160	10,929
Some city of 25,000+ not a seaport . . . . .	0	54,204
Rest of country . . . . .	38,618	109,152

The above figures show that within a period averaging six months after their arrival at New York City not less than 107,000 out of 134,000 immigrants, or four-fifths of the total number, had left that city, and dispersed over other parts of the country. Many of them doubtless went to some one of the other seaports of at least 25,000 inhabitants, and many arrivals at these other seaports doubtless removed to New York City. Yet the number found in all these other seaports by the census was 17,000 less than

the number who landed there; that is, at least three-fifths of the arrivals at those ports had left them for other parts of the country. On the other hand, more than a quarter of those who arrived in the country were found within six months at some one of the 149 cities having at least 25,000 inhabitants which were not seaport cities, and which must have been reached, therefore, by a process of migration and dispersion within the country. More than half of the total arrivals, also, were found outside of any city of that size; that is, in what might be called the country districts of the United States. These figures prove with a conclusiveness hitherto unattainable that the congestion of the foreign born in our large cities, particularly the seaport cities, is in no sense an evidence that the arrivals linger or stagnate there. On the contrary, the foreign-born population of the United States is in a process of incessant and most rapid migration over the face of the country, following the allurements of economic advantages and opportunities as they present themselves.

A more detailed study of the distribution of these recent arrivals may be found illuminating. They were distributed through the five main divisions and through the cities and country districts as shown in the following table:—

DIVISION.	Number of foreign born who have been in the United States less than one year.			Per cent. living in cities of 25,000.	
	Total.	In cities of 25,000+.	In smaller cities and country districts.	Among total population.	Among foreign born in U.S. less than 1 year
Continental United States	201,128	91,976	109,152	26.0	45.7
North Atlantic . . . . .	129,665	68,561	61,104	48.0	52.9
North Central . . . . .	45,087	16,963	28,124	23.1	37.6
Western . . . . .	18,093	4,663	13,430	25.2	25.8
South Atlantic . . . . .	3,965	1,291	2,674	12.4	32.6
South Central . . . . .	4,318	498	3,820	8.4	11.6

The preceding figures show that four-ninths of the recent immigrants are living in the 160 cities which contain only about one-fourth of the total population. But they suggest, also, that this difference is due mainly to the region to which they first come. In the North Atlantic, South Central, and Western divisions these recent immigrants are distributed between city and country in almost the same proportions that prevail among the general population. In the South Atlantic and North Central divisions recent immigrants are massed in the cities. There are 37 States in the Union each of which had in 1900 at least one city of 25,000+ inhabitants. In 12 of these States the foreign born reported as in the country less than one year were more numerous in the cities than in the rest of the State. In 25 the recent immigrants were most numerous in the country districts. In Pennsylvania, for example, the foreign born who had been here less than one year and who were residing in 1900 in some one of its 18 cities of 25,000+ population, numbered 12,841. Those in the rest of the State numbered 20,205.

Additional evidence bearing upon the parts of the country to which recent immigrants are going may be found by computing the per cent. that the foreign born who have been in a place less than one year make of all foreign born in that place.<sup>1</sup> The figures show that in West Virginia the newly arrived immigrants constitute a larger proportion of the total foreign born population than elsewhere, and in Kentucky and Arkansas they constitute a smaller proportion than elsewhere. In the cities the largest proportion of recent immigrants is found in the State of Washington, the smallest in Kentucky. In the country districts the largest proportion is in West Virginia, the smallest in Kentucky, Missouri, and Arkansas. Can it be shown that this distribution of recent immigrants indicates

<sup>1</sup> See Twelfth Census, Supplementary Analysis, Table XXXIV.

a failure to appreciate the economic opportunities before them or that it could be materially improved if guided by any government agency?

We may pass now to a study of the distribution of certain nationalities between city and country. In the report of the Senate Committee on Immigration of 1896 the immigration from Austria-Hungary, Italy, and Russia, is referred to as undesirable and as tending to swarm in the cities. In the following table the nationalities most concentrated in the cities of 25,000+ in 1900 are indicated:—

COUNTRY OF BIRTH.	FOREIGN BORN.		
	Total.	In cities of 25,000+.	Per cent. urban.
Russia . . . . .	423,726	317,798	74.9
Poland . . . . .	383,407	239,946	62.6
Italy . . . . .	484,027	302,324	62.4
Ireland . . . . .	1,615,459	1,003,810	62.0
Bohemia . . . . .	156,891	85,287	54.3
Austria . . . . .	275,907	147,730	53.5
Hungary . . . . .	145,714	77,879	53.4
Germany . . . . .	2,663,418	1,339,351	50.2

The preceding figures show that the Russians, Poles, Italians, and Irish were most massed in the cities of the country, each of these four elements having between three-fifths and three-fourths of its numbers in the cities. The difficulties in adjusting the census figures of country of birth to those of the Bureau of Immigration for Russia and Poland have been found insuperable. For some years the Bureau of Immigration assigned the Polish-speaking immigrants to Poland, for others to the country now governing the part of Poland in which the immigrant was born. Because of this difficulty the distribution of the Italians has been chosen for special study.

To study the distribution of Italians from New York City between 1890 and 1900, it is important to ascertain

the number living in 1890 within the present limits of Greater New York. I have determined that number as follows, the figures for Queens and Westchester being estimates:—

New York County . . . . .	39,951
Kings County . . . . .	9,789
Richmond County . . . . .	262
Queens County . . . . .	948
Westchester County . . . . .	184
Total . . . . .	51,134

The number of Italians in 1890 within the present limits of Queens County has been estimated on the assumption that the part cut off from Queens in 1899 to form Nassau County contained in 1890 the same proportion that it did in 1900 of all the Italians in the former Queens County at the same date. The number of Italians in 1890 in the part of Westchester later incorporated in New York has been estimated as 10.1 per cent. of the total number of Italians in Westchester in 1890 (namely, 1,820) because 10.1 per cent. of the population of that county in 1890 was included in the part transferred to New York.

During the decade between 1890 and 1900 651,893 Italian immigrants landed in the United States. In the same period the number of Italians residing in the United States increased 301,447, a number equal to 46.2 per cent. of the current of immigration. During the same decade about 627,736 immigrants from Italy, or 96.3 per cent. of the total current, landed in New York City.<sup>1</sup> Assuming that 46.2 per cent. of these immigrants, or 290,000, remained in the country until 1900, and contributed to swell its population of Italian birth at that date (the others

<sup>1</sup> The figures for Italians landing in New York 1890-96, inclusive, are in the published reports of the Bureau of Immigration, those for 1898-1900 have been kindly furnished me from manuscript records of the Bureau, the non-existent figures for 1896-98 have been estimated on the assumption that the average proportion in the other eight years (96.3 per cent.) held true for those.

either returning or dying or filling gaps caused by deaths among the Italians in the country in 1890), and assuming, further, that none of these 290,000 removed from New York City, the Italian born population of that city in 1900 would have been 341,134. It was 145,433, indicating that about 196,000, or two-thirds, of the Italian additions to the population of New York City during the decade had left before its close.

A different method of analysis is made easier by some figures recently published by the Census Office. The country has been divided into urban and rural by putting into the urban class for 1890 and 1900 all places which had 25,000 or more inhabitants in 1890 and into the rural all the rest of the population. The urban population of Italian birth was 107,337 in 1890 and 296,040 in 1900, showing an increase of 176 per cent. in ten years. The rural population of Italian birth was 75,243 in 1890 and 187,987 in 1900, showing an increase of 150 per cent. in ten years. When one considers that at least nine-tenths of the additions to the foreign-born population are made in the first instance to the cities, and also that cities, especially in the North, have a much more rapid growth than country districts, it is hard to find in these figures any evidence of a tendency to city life distinguishing the Italians either from the native population or from other classes of the foreign born.

With regard to the second point the evidence seems to warrant the conclusion that neither recent immigrants as a class nor Italian immigrants who were selected as the most available national type of recent immigrants show any characteristic tendency towards or fondness for city life.

III. The evidence on the third point, that this tendency towards urban life is characteristic of illiterate immigrants, is so slight as to require little analysis. On De-

cember 13, 14, and 15, 1895, members of the Executive Committee of the Immigration Restriction League examined "about 1,000 immigrants over sixteen years" of age concerning their destination and their ability to read and write. The figures indicate that 865 were actually examined, of whom 331 were found on a test to be illiterate and 534 able to read. 17 per cent. of the 534 literates and 11 per cent. of the 331 illiterates gave as their destination some State of the Mississippi Valley.<sup>1</sup> The difference is too slight to be significant, the numerical basis too small to furnish more than a mere indication, the statements made at landing regarding the intended destination are untrustworthy as evidence of what residence will be chosen, and the illiterates as a class would know less of American geography, and be less likely to have definite plans. The same report recites evidence from the Commissioner of Labor's Report that the slum districts of Baltimore, Chicago, New York, and Philadelphia are largely tenanted by illiterate foreigners and their children. But this evidence throws little light upon the real issue.

If we were to admit that illiteracy is more prevalent among the urban foreign born, this would not prove a tendency of illiterates towards cities. It might be due either to the fact that the urban foreign born had been in the country, as already proved, a shorter time than the rural foreign born, and in many instances not long enough to have learned to read and write, or to the fact that the urban foreign born are the survivors from a more recent current of immigration, and that recent immigrants are more illiterate than those who formerly came to this country.

But first we may ask the question, Is illiteracy more prevalent among urban immigrants? The following table gives the figures for the city and country districts of New

<sup>1</sup> Fifty-fourth Congress, First Session, Senate Report No. 290.



York State. The per cent. of illiterates among the foreign-born white population of the cities of 25,000+ and the rest of the State, 1900, was as follows:—

<i>City.</i>	<i>Per cent. illiterates among foreign-born whites at least 10 years of age.</i>
Rochester . . . . .	7.9
Syracuse . . . . .	9.7
Albany . . . . .	10.0
Auburn . . . . .	10.6
Yonkers . . . . .	10.9
Buffalo . . . . .	12.0
Elmira . . . . .	12.4
Binghamton . . . . .	13.8
New York . . . . .	13.9
Troy . . . . .	14.0
Utica . . . . .	16.0
Schenectady . . . . .	16.1
Rest of State . . . . .	16.1

Each of the twelve cities of 25,000+ in New York State, except Schenectady, has a lower per cent. of illiteracy among the immigrants than is found outside these cities. In other States similar results would be found. As a rule, illiteracy in any class of the population is more prevalent outside of cities than in them. Not merely is there a lack of evidence to prove the third point, there is also direct evidence to disprove it.

The first three positions being found to lack evidence, the third and fourth, which assumed their truth, fall to the ground. If there is no evidence of a disadvantageous or dangerous tendency towards cities on the part of immigrants as a class, of recent immigrants, or of illiterate immigrants, the main argument in favor of intervention by the government to distribute them properly falls to the ground.

WALTER F. WILLCOX.